University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

2005

Graduate students' perceptions of contrapower sexual harassment.

Charmaine Mohipp
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Mohipp, Charmaine, "Graduate students' perceptions of contrapower sexual harassment." (2005).
Electronic Theses and Dissertations. 2246.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/2246>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

GRADUATE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF CONTRAPOWER
SEXUAL HARASSMENT

by

Charmaine Mohipp

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
through the Department of Psychology
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts at the
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2005

© 2005 Charmaine Mohipp

Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 0-494-09750-7

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 0-494-09750-7

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

Sexual harassment is a serious problem no matter who perpetrates it, however, the majority of empirical sexual harassment literature has examined traditional (supervisor/supervisee, faculty/student) and peer sexual harassment with only a small number of studies examining contrapower sexual harassment. Contrapower sexual harassment can be defined as the sexual harassment of individuals (usually women) with more organizational power by others (usually men) with less organizational power. This study examined attitudes toward contrapower harassment in graduate students, a unique sample because of their dual role as a student and a teacher. A mail survey was distributed to a random sample of 595 graduate students at the University of Windsor and was completed by 172 graduate students (29% response rate). Participants received one of four sexual harassment scenarios in which the role of the graduate student (victim or perpetrator), as well as the type of harassment (contrapower or traditional) was varied. They rated how likely it was that the scenario was sexual harassment, as well as made judgments about the responsibility of the victim and perpetrator. The results showed that graduate students viewed contrapower sexual harassment as less indicative of sexual harassment than traditional sexual harassment. Those with teaching experience perceived the situations provided in the scenarios as more indicative of sexual harassment than participants without teaching experience. In addition, males (without teaching experience) who read the graduate student victim scenario perceived sexual harassment less and assigned more responsibility to the victim and less responsibility to the perpetrator than all other participants. Attitudes toward

sexual harassment and previous sexual harassment experience were also related to perceptions of sexual harassment. These findings suggest that people take sexual harassment less seriously in situations involving contrapower sexual harassment. Furthermore, it is possible that teaching experience makes one more aware of the power differentials involved in sexual harassment situations. Prevention of sexual harassment may need to focus on giving potential instructors/professors (particularly men) more teaching experience, as well as increasing awareness of contrapower sexual harassment, which in turn may increase support for victims and reduce perpetration of harassment.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Charlene Senn, for her wisdom, guidance, support, and generosity. Thank you for providing me with the motivation to push through these last two years. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Dennis Jackson and Dr. Anne Forrest, for your support and feedback. Your suggestions helped to make this project even better.

To my friends, Karen and Christa, thank you for being there for me when I was struggling. I know you were able to empathize, and being part of our small cohort has been very comforting when I needed it. To the ladies in my research group, Surbhi, Sherry, Salma, Kristin, and Paula, thank you for giving me so much support and for your intellectual stimulation! To Steph, Ritu, Reagan, and Sabrina, thanks for all the proofreading and emotional support, I am truly appreciative.

To my mother, Apolina Mohipp, I would like to say thank you for your encouragement. You have always inspired me to do my best and you have always believed in me. Finally, to my partner, Alex, thank you for the patience and strength you have given me when I felt I had none. Your encouragement and love has kept me going these past two years, I am blessed to have you in my life.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Feminism and Sexual Harassment	1
Theoretical Models of Contrapower Sexual Harassment	3
Definitional Issues	5
Prevalence and Incidence of Sexual Harassment	6
Contrapower Sexual Harassment	8
Effects on the Victims of Sexual Harassment	11
Theoretical Underpinning for Individuals' Perceptions of Sexual Harassment	13
Perceptions of Contrapower Sexual Harassment	15
Factors Influencing Perceptions of Behaviour That Constitute Sexual Harassment	18
The Current Study	19
Hypotheses	20
II. METHOD	
Participants	22
Materials	23
Procedure	25
III. RESULTS	
Reliability of All Measures	27
Background Variables	27
Preliminary Analyses	27
Effects of Gender on Ratings	31
Relationship of Attitudes to Perceptions of Sexual Harassment	33
Effect of Type of Harassment, Role, Gender, and Teaching Experience	39

IV. DISCUSSION	51
Limitations and Strengths of the Study and Future Directions	59
REFERENCES	62
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Hypothetical Sexual Harassment Scenarios	68
Appendix B: Attitudes toward Feminism and the Women's Movement Scale	69
Appendix C: Sexual Experiences Questionnaire	70
Appendix D: Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale	75
Appendix E: Demographic Questions	77
Appendix F: Introductory Email	78
Appendix G: Letter of Information	79
VITA AUCTORIS	82

List of Tables

Table 1	Reliability Coefficients, Scale Means, and Scale Standard Deviations and Ranges	28
Table 2	Participants per Department in Comparison to Total Graduate Students per Department	29
Table 3	Occurrence of Sexual Harassment	30
Table 4	Intercorrelations Between Dependent Variables, Independent Variables, and Covariates	32
Table 5	Means and Standard Deviations and Significant Values on Key Variables	34
Table 6	Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Gender (Block 1) and Gender, SHAS, FWM, and SEQ (Block 2) on the Degree to Which the Incident Constitutes Sexual Harassment	35
Table 7	Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Gender (Block 1) and Gender, SHAS, and FWM (Block 2) on Responsibility Ratings of the Perpetrator	37
Table 8	Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Gender (Block 1) and Gender, SHAS, and FWM (Block 2) on Responsibility Ratings of the Victim	38
Table 9	Analysis of Covariance for the Degree to Which the Incident Constitutes Sexual Harassment	41
Table 10	Analysis of Covariance for Responsibility of Perpetrator Ratings	47
Table 11	Analysis of Covariance for Responsibility of Victim Ratings	49

List of Figures

Figure 1	The interactive effect of gender, role of graduate student and teaching experience on perceptions of sexual harassment	42
Figure 2	The interactive effect of gender, teaching experience, and role of graduate student on perpetrator responsibility ratings	45
Figure 3	The interactive effect of gender, role of graduate student, and teaching experience on victim responsibility ratings	46
Figure 4	The interactive effect of gender, type of sexual harassment, and teaching experience on victim responsibility ratings	50

Graduate Students' Perceptions of Contrapower Sexual Harassment

Introduction

The sexual harassment of women has occurred for centuries; however, it was not until the 1970s that it acquired a name. Laws against sexual harassment have been put into place, and there has been an increase in awareness of the problem; however, many women unfortunately still experience sexual harassment. It is a widespread problem for women in all domains of life, and it can occur at work, at school, or even while walking down the street. Recipients of sexual harassment, regardless of age, race, or occupation, can all feel its negative impact.

Three major areas of sexual harassment have been identified: traditional sexual harassment (perpetrators in positions of power over the victim), peer sexual harassment (peers at the same power level harassing peers), and contrapower sexual harassment (perpetrators of lesser power on one domain harassing victims with more power on that domain) (McKinney, 1990). In all of these situations, perpetrators are usually male and victims are typically female (McKinney, Olson, & Satterfield, 1988). Thus, for the purpose of this study, in the experimental portion of the study, I only examined male perpetrators harassing female victims.

Feminism and Sexual Harassment

Perspectives on and theories of sexual harassment vary, ranging from evolutionary/biological explanations to feminist theories based on power differentials. Traditionally, non-feminist theories examining sexual harassment have focused on organizational power (looking at the hierarchical structure of authority). Other theories have used situational variables, personality characteristics (of both perpetrators and victims), as well as various other individual difference variables to explain sexual

harassment. However, a feminist perspective focuses on gendered power. It is this theoretical perspective that I found most useful in my approach to the study.

The feminist perspective views sexual harassment as a form of violence against women which results from structural inequality (Wise & Stanley, 1987; Samuels, 2003). In reality, sexual harassment is not a deviation or a result of characteristics specific within an individual, but rather it acts as “a manifestation of [women’s] economic oppression that is rooted in a deeply gendered and patriarchal society” (Samuels, 2003, p. 470). Within society, men hold power, and women are made vulnerable regardless of their status position, for the sole reason that they are women (Crocker, 1983). In addition, this perspective recognizes that race, class, and sexual orientation also influence the power that perpetrators hold (Rospenda, Richman & Nawyn, 1998).

It has also been argued that the dominant male ideology that exists in society is incorporated into organizational culture and this dominant ideology even extends into academia (Gutek, 1985; Samuels, 2003). Sexual harassment that occurs in the academic setting is particularly troublesome. A learning environment is a place where obtaining knowledge is a priority, and this should be a safe place for all students. However, if a student is being sexually harassed, it can have negative consequences on the way she or he may learn, creating an unwelcome academic environment (Schneider, 1987). Graduate students may be uniquely vulnerable because of the commitment to and length of graduate school programs, which could often last two or more years. They are also in an interesting position because of their dual role as both teacher (teaching assistant and course instructor) and student. These dual roles may give graduate students a unique vantage point to the issues of sexual harassment because they are in a position of institutional power as teachers and lack such power as students. The objective of this

study is to examine graduate students' attitudes and perceptions toward contrapower sexual harassment and contrast them with the perceptions they hold in relation to traditional sexual harassment.

Theoretical Models of Contrapower Sexual Harassment

Different ways of understanding sexual harassment can affect the way it is studied. An examination of the theories posited to explain harassment over the past 20 years demonstrated that few theories can explain the existence of contrapower harassment and rarely incorporate the feminist idea of gendered power as part of sexual harassment. I will review and demonstrate which theories are useful to the study of contrapower sexual harassment.

Sex-role Spillover Model. Rospenda, Richman and Nawyn (1998) note that there are models of sexual harassment that try to combine organizational and sociocultural levels of analysis. One such model is the sex-role spillover model. Gutek and Morasch (1982) proposed that sexual harassment of women at work is a result of sex-role spillover. It can be defined as "the carryover into the workplace of gender-based expectations for behavior that are irrelevant or inappropriate to work" (Gutek & Morasch, 1982, p. 55). According to this approach, sexual harassment is the result of perpetrators asserting traditional gender roles (the sociocultural aspect). Simultaneously, these gender roles are then maintained at the organizational level, instead of adhering to appropriate work roles.

Sociocultural Model. Another way of understanding sexual harassment is through the sociocultural model. According to Tangri, Burt, and Johnson (1982) the sociocultural model is characteristic of the patriarchal society in which we live. The model focuses on economic and social factors of sexual harassment. It suggests that women have been socialized to be passive and submissive. Furthermore, men are taught to be dominant and

view their sexually harassing behaviors as natural and justified (Sbraga & O'Donohue, 2000). The power differential is based on societal status; therefore sexual harassment occurs as a result of social power. Gender is a better predictor of who will be victimized (women more than men) rather than a position in an organization. It can also predict who will harass (men more than women). In accordance with the sociocultural model, the purpose of sexual harassment is to keep women economically dependent and subordinate to men (Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982).

Power Model. Another example of the amalgamation between the organizational and sociocultural levels of analysis is the power model (Cleveland and Kerst, 1993). This approach posits that in addition to formal power, persons gain power from sociocultural as well as interpersonal or individual sources. Their model suggests that individual characteristics have to do with power and that mechanisms linking power to sexual harassment may differ substantially, depending on the position of the harasser. For example, organizational power refers to hierarchies within organizations – depending on what position one occupies in the workplace. Societal power refers to the hierarchical structure within society, suggesting that men are seen as more powerful, and women as less powerful. Interpersonal power refers to certain behaviours that powerholders perform (e.g., influence tactics).

In summary, the power model (Cleveland & Kerst, 1993), the sociocultural model, and Gutek and Morasch's (1982) sex-role spillover model, all offer plausible causal explanations regarding contrapower sexual harassment. According to Cleveland and Kerst (1993), harassment by subordinates is more likely carried out in order to gain power or minimize power differentials. In contrast, Tangri, Burt and Johnson (1982) use the sociocultural model to explain that in a patriarchal society, power belongs to men,

regardless of the organizational power that women may hold. On the other hand, Gutek (1985) suggests that the goal of the perpetrator is to devalue women, highlighting traditional gender stereotypes over the woman's work role. An amalgamation of these models appears to offer the best explanation for contrapower sexual harassment.

Regardless of the organizational power that women have, men assert their social power above and beyond those levels by means of sexual harassment. Consequently, some male students may feel that they can sexually harass female professors/instructors. Sexual harassment therefore is another attempt by men to dominate women. The feminist viewpoint noted above takes into account the social power men have in society, which maintains the subordination of women (Hoffman, 1986). It should be made clear however, that while these perspectives may explain why contrapower sexual harassment occurs, there are other, more traditional theories that may explain how people react to and perceive sexual harassment. These theories will be discussed later under the heading Theoretical Underpinnings for Individuals' Perceptions of Sexual Harassment.

Definitional Issues

In psychological research, several definitions for sexual harassment have been put forward. These definitions include sexual harassment being described as any conduct of a sexual nature that interferes with the work environment (Sbraga & O'Donohue, 2000) or an abusive work relationship (Rospenda, Richman, & Nawyn, 1998). The previous definitions that focus on the work environment suggest that (perhaps) sexual harassment happens most often in the workplace. However, an abundance of empirical literature provides evidence of sexual harassment of students occurring at universities and colleges (Adams, Kottke, & Padgett, 1983; Cammaert, 1985; Lott, Reilly, & Howard, 1982; Mazer & Percival, 1989; McKinney, Olson, & Satterfield, 1987; Schneider, 1987). A number of

researchers and feminist theorists (Dziech & Weiner, 1984; Hoffman, 1986) believe it is more appropriate to broaden the definition of sexual harassment to one that emerges from a sociocultural power discrepancy between men and women, which can operate in a variety of settings (Hoffman, 1986).

For the purpose of this study, I used Gelfand, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow's (1995) identification of three types of sexual harassment which was initially based on Till's (1980, as cited in Gelfand et al., 1995) identification of five levels of sexual harassment. Gelfand et al.'s identification incorporates the broader context and collapses the behaviour further. Using the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ), they identified gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion as the major forms of harassment. Gender harassment is characterized by both verbal and nonverbal behaviors that are derogatory, humiliating, or aggressive and targets the victim because of her female gender. Unwanted sexual attention is considered to include a broad range of sexual behaviours that are unwelcome (e.g., repeatedly asking for dates or requesting sexual relationships). Sexual coercion is typically described as behavior that pressures, threatens, or suggests bribes for sexual favors in order to gain some sort of benefit (Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995).

Prevalence and Incidence of Sexual Harassment

As definitions of sexual harassment may vary, estimates of the frequency of sexual harassment may fluctuate as well. Rates that are reported can depend on such factors as sampling strategy, sample characteristics (age, race, sex, etc.), response rates, methods and measures used, time frame, and environment (McKinney, 1992; O'Donohue, Downs & Yeater, 1998). For instance, Gruber (1990) examined the pervasiveness of sexual harassment from 18 major studies concentrating on this subject (conducted from

1979 to 1986). The settings in which the harassment took place encompassed a wide a variety of occupations and organizations across North America. He found that the median percentage of women reporting sexual harassment in these studies was 44%. This is consistent with other recent data obtained, ranging between 23% (Welsh & Nierobisz, 1997 as cited in Welsh, 1999) to 51% (Gruber, 1997).

Studies conducted in academic settings have found rates similar to Gruber's (1990). Fitzgerald et al. (1988) found that 51% to 76% of women reported experiencing some form of harassment. Stephenson, Watkins, Wallace, Schwerin, and Vaux (as cited in Stockdale & Vaux, 1993) reported a rate of 59% for their sample of undergraduate students. When surveying undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty/staff, from a large Midwestern university, Stockdale and Vaux (1993), found a prevalence rate for gender harassment of 60%, 63%, and 69%, respectively. Sexual seduction, defined as a 'proposition', prevalence rates were 18% (undergraduates), 26% (graduates) and 35% (staff/faculty). Sexual bribery/coercion and sexual imposition rates were 4% and 4% for undergraduates, 5% and 18% for graduate students, and 3% and 23% for staff/faculty, respectively.

More specific studies focusing on graduate students' experiences with sexual harassment have found similar rates. Schneider (1987) assessed female graduate students' experiences with sexual harassment and reported that 60% of the sample experienced "everyday harassment" (which did not explicitly involve coercion to date or engage in sexual activity) at least once by male faculty. Of the aforementioned 60% who had been harassed, 49% reported having been "ogled and stared at" (Schneider, 1987, p. 52) by faculty, and 10% had been sexually propositioned.

McKinney, Olson, and Satterfield (1988) found that of their sample of 281 graduate students, 35% of female graduate students and 9% of male graduate students reported having been sexually harassed. Respondents (both male and female) reported experiencing sexist comments (29%) and undue attention (15%), as well as verbal and physical advances, explicit sexual propositions, and sexual bribery (2% to 6%). The perpetrators were individuals in positions of power (e.g., professors).

These studies demonstrate that all types of sexual harassment are experienced by graduate students. Moreover, they demonstrate that sexual harassment is a serious problem in academic settings. Although sexual harassment in this context can occur to either men or women, the aforementioned results demonstrated that females are the most common victims.

Contrapower Sexual Harassment

The majority of the empirical literature in psychology examines the traditional form of sexual harassment where the harasser is in a position of power or as Benson (1984) refers to it, “power sexual harassment” (p. 517). In other words, sexual harassment occurs when a subordinate is sexually harassed by someone with more organizational power (a superior). Recent studies have indicated that sexual harassment of women in power positions by subordinates also occurs (Grauerholz, 1989; McKinney 1990, 1992, 1994; Stockdale, Vaux, & Cashin, 1995). Some feminist researchers (Wilson & Thompson, 2001) suggest that, “there are general structural mechanisms which reproduce a patriarchal order and in which academic women are seen as actual or potential threats to male power” (p. 72). As an extension to Crocker’s (1983) analysis of definitions of sexual harassment in the domains of college and university, Benson (1984) referred to the sexual harassment of those with more organizational power by those with less organizational

power as “contrapower sexual harassment” (p. 517). Rospenda, Richman, and Nawyn (1998) note that contrapower sexual harassment “reinforces the inferior gender status of women by negating their higher organizational status in the workplace” (p. 41). Matchen and DeSouza (2000) also suggest that contrapower sexual harassment reinforces a woman’s traditional role in a patriarchal society in which men, even male students, hold the power.

According to DeSouza and Fansler (2003), contrapower sexual harassment can occur quite frequently in the academic setting. Grauerholz (1989) conducted one of the first studies specifically examining the problem of contrapower sexual harassment. She surveyed 208 female professors from a large public research institution in the U.S. and found that the most common experience of contrapower sexual harassment involved sexist comments (32 %) from mostly male students. Other common experiences included undue attention (18 %), obscene phone calls from persons believed to be students (17 %), verbal sexual comments (15%), body language (12%), and written sexual comments (8%). A small percentage of professors experienced explicit sexual propositions (3%) and attempts at sexual bribery (1%).

McKinney (1990, 1992, 1994) has conducted multiple studies examining contrapower sexual harassment of faculty. McKinney (1990) found a prevalence rate of 20% when professors used their own definition of sexual harassment and an even higher rate of up to 40% when they used a list of 10 key behaviours provided by the researcher. The list comprised of behaviors such as: sexist comments, undue attention, verbal sexual advances, body language, invitation, physical advances, explicit sexual propositions, and sexual bribery. Women, more than men, viewed the specific behaviors listed as sexual harassment and yielded significantly higher scores on the attitudes toward sexual

harassment scale indicating a less tolerant attitude. McKinney (1992) reported that faculty saw obscene phone calls and explicit verbal-physical sexual harassment (touching and asking for a sexual encounter) as more negative than implicit verbal-physical harassment (sitting closely and commenting on one's attractiveness), with female faculty once again viewing the behaviors as more negative in comparison to male faculty members.

Recently, a closer examination of contrapower sexual harassment experienced by college faculty has been noted (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003; Matchen & DeSouza, 2000; McKinney & Crittendon, 1992) and has yielded similar results. Specifically, these studies questioned students about their behaviours toward faculty members. Results revealed that many of the students reported behaviours that qualified as sexual harassment of faculty (McKinney & Crittendon, 1992). However, McKinney and Crittendon found that no student admitted to "sexually harassing" faculty, even though 18% of students reported behaving in at least one of the 10 aforementioned specific behaviours that constitute sexual harassment. Matchen and DeSouza's investigation of sexual harassment by college students toward faculty members included 359 students and 102 faculty members. Overall, 63% of students reported engaging at least once in a potentially sexually harassing behaviour toward faculty. In addition, 53% of faculty reported experiencing at least one potentially sexually harassing behaviour from students. Female professors reported experiencing unwanted sexual attention from students significantly more often than male professors did, and were also considerably more bothered by unwanted sexual attention from their students as compared to male professors. While DeSouza and Fansler found a similar rate of faculty reporting sexual harassment, they found a lower level of sexual harassment admitted by students. Thirty two percent of students surveyed reported engaging at least once in sexually harassing behavior toward a faculty member and 52%

of the faculty surveyed reported at least once having experienced sexually harassing behavior from students. While a lower rate of students reported engaging in sexually harassing behavior, faculty rates were still similar. DeSouza and Fansler speculated that the difference in the rates of reported sexually harassing behaviors may have been a direct result of different time frames used (no time frame in Matchen and DeSouza versus the last 24 months in DeSouza and Fansler). In addition, DeSouza and Fansler used random sampling, while Matchen and DeSouza did not. Therefore, the lower rates are probably most sound and demonstrate high levels of contrapower harassment across a two-year period. These studies support the belief that contrapower sexual harassment is an ongoing concern in academia.

Effects on the Victims of Sexual Harassment

Victims of sexual harassment across settings experience various effects, both professional and personal. Gutek (1985) found that victims recorded decreased job performance, as well as disruptions in their careers and relationships with coworkers. Victims may also experience psychological and physical symptoms such as anxiety, depression, irritability, anger, weight loss, uncontrolled crying, fatigue, and dental and gastrointestinal problems (Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997; Gutek, 1985; Gutek & Koss, 1993). Other reactions include feelings of guilt, embarrassment, humiliation, and alienation (Salisbury, Ginori, Remick, & Stringer, 1986). Dansky and Kilpatrick (1997) also found that female victims who have been subjected to sexual harassment are more at risk for developing Post Traumatic Stress Disorder or Major Depression.

For student victims, once a student has been sexually harassed by faculty, all future contact with that person is “tainted and suspect” (Crocker, 1983, p. 705). According to Dzeich and Weiner (1984) it “often forces a student to forfeit work,

research, educational comfort, and even a career.” (p. 10). As Schneider (1987) points out, in addition to being sexually harassed, a female graduate student has a disadvantaged position in academia compared to men. Such disadvantages include familial responsibilities (e.g., marriage and children), “the geographical constraints of two-career families, sex discrimination in graduate school policies, [and] subtle discrimination in the form of disinterest, exclusion, and insults” (Schneider, 1987, p. 47). Graduate students may have few options other than to stay in a sexually harassing scholastic environment, especially when considering the difficulty of leaving when only part way through a graduate program. It may be bureaucratically, academically, and economically unsound (Schneider, 1987) to do otherwise. Graduate students experiencing these effects may potentially rethink their career path or role in academia.

The physical and psychological consequences to the victim outlined above also apply to victims of contrapower sexual harassment. Female victims of contrapower sexual harassment are shown to have higher levels of depression and anxiety than male victims (DeSouza and Fansler, 2003). McKinney (1994) reported that faculty members who experienced sexual harassment (traditional, peer, and contrapower) indicated also experiencing embarrassment, increased cynicism, anger, frustration, and some fear or anxiety. Cognitive responses included denial, worrying about other victims, being distracted by the incident, and dreading seeing the offender. McKinney noted that many members of faculty also felt self-blame. Further, family/personal lives and professional relationships were also affected. Benson (1984) refers to the consequences of contrapower sexual harassment as possibly “erode [ing] professional self-image, and prove [ing] destructive to her professional growth” (p. 518). It can change a professor’s attitudes towards students, teaching, the class as a whole, as well as instill doubts and

insecurities, leading to a general distrust and lack of connection with students (Benson, 1984; Schneider, 1987).

Theoretical Underpinning for Individuals' Perceptions of Sexual Harassment

As previously mentioned, a variety of theories exist which attempt to explain sexual harassment. While these theories are useful in explaining why contrapower harassment exists, more traditional organizational theories may be more beneficial in explaining views held by everyday people. This would mean that perceptions of victims and perpetrators in harassment situations may well be best predicted by using assumptions untouched by nuanced readings of gender and power. The majority of people have probably been exposed to more traditional explanations of sexual harassment, and therefore may tend to perceive sexual harassment based on organizational hierarchies alone rather than allowing for a gendered power perspective. Two such theories are presented here. One theory can explain why people may view contrapower sexual harassment less seriously than traditional sexual harassment, while the alternative theory predicts the opposite results.

Organizational Model. The organizational model summarized by Tangri, Burt, and Johnson (1982) proposes that there are certain conditions in organizations that encourage sexual harassment. It can also explain why everyday people might view contrapower sexual harassment as less serious than traditional sexual harassment. It is suggested that sexual harassment occurs due to the hierarchical structure that exists within organizations, where men are most often in power positions. This model describes sexual harassment perpetrated against subordinate members by supervisors who use their position or power in an organization. Expected victims would be those who are low in organizational power, whereas expected harassers are those that are higher in

organizational power or have a more secure position in the organization than the victim. This model posits that sexual harassment functions to deny subordinates autonomy and security, allowing the harasser to use his/her power status to manipulate (Tangri, Burt & Johnson, 1982). This model does not work well to explain contrapower sexual harassment. In fact, it provides a hypothetical explanation for a greater degree of negative attitudes directed toward traditional sexual harassment as compared to contrapower sexual harassment. If we were to follow the organizational model, one would expect that since subordinates are denied their independence and security, and are manipulated by the perpetrators' abuse of power, they would be seen as more vulnerable, resulting in more negative attitudes toward traditional sexual harassment. Consequently, in a contrapower sexual harassment scenario, one might believe that the perpetrator is not in a position to manipulate a "superior" since the victim "should" be more empowered to resist and thus be less vulnerable. As a result of this belief, one could hypothesize that contrapower sexual harassment would be viewed less negatively than traditional sexual harassment.

Role-Discrepant Model. An alternative theory that predicts why everyday people might view traditional sexual harassment less seriously than contrapower sexual harassment is the role-discrepant model. According to this model, role-discrepant behaviour is at a greater risk of being construed as sexual harassment (Pryor, 1985). Furthermore, Wayne (2000) explains that the role-discrepant model is most closely associated with an explanation of more negative attitudes toward contrapower sexual harassment because they result from the amount of role deviation that must take place in order for a subordinate to harass an individual of authority. Factors such as age, marital status and power status of the perpetrator contribute to one's overall perception of sexual

harassment (Wayne, 2000). Therefore atypical role behavior may be regarded as more sexually harassing due to its deviation away from the role that is characteristically expected of the perpetrator.

Victims of contrapower sexual harassment, who are in an organizational power position, may be viewed by the average person as more capable of handling sexual harassment, and able to use their power to discipline the perpetrator. As a result, perceptions of the victim might be less supportive. A lack of support given to a victim could be dangerous considering that the recipient of sexual harassment would still feel victimized.

Perceptions of Contrapower Sexual Harassment

Wayne (2000) examined the role of power in perceptions of sexual harassment using a mock court case. She compared positions of power, age, and gender in order to test the predictive power of both the organizational model and role-discrepant model. Wayne used the organizational model to hypothesize that perpetrators of contrapower sexual harassment would be rated most favorably compared to perpetrators of traditional and peer sexual harassment. Further, the role-discrepant model was used to hypothesize that perpetrators of contrapower sexual harassment would be rated least favorably. Previous research comparing power positions among perpetrator's (high versus equal), has indicated that peer harassers are perceived less negatively since they have less organizational power (Wayne, 2000). Therefore, Wayne broadened the organizational model for the purpose of including less negative perceptions toward contrapower harassers. Participants were mock jurors presented with a hostile work environment court case. They were asked to provide their verdicts in the case, rate how unwelcome the harasser's behaviour was, and how much responsibility the organization had in the case.

Wayne found that compared to age and gender, the position of the harasser had the strongest influence on sexual harassment case decisions. However, results showed that contrapower harassers were found most guilty, followed by traditional sexual harassers, and then co-worker sexual harassers. In the contrapower situation the sexual harassment behavior was found to be most unwelcome and jurors assigned the most organizational responsibility compared to either the traditional or peer harassment situations. Wayne suggested the role-discrepant model of sexual harassment best explains these perceptions toward contrapower sexual harassment. Perceptions of sexual harassment may be more negative toward a contrapower situation rather than a traditional situation since the subordinate's role within a contrapower scenario significantly strays from the norm. Wayne identifies a limitation of the study as the use of undergraduate students to judge a workplace case, who might not have been representative of typical jurors. Additionally, jurors are usually presented with more information in a given court case and are required to make judgements of real people.

As Wayne (2000) has suggested, there is insufficient research focused on contrapower sexual harassment thereby limiting our understanding of attitudes toward and perceptions of contrapower sexual harassment. Although Sbraga and O'Donohue (2000) conducted a thorough analysis of traditional sexual harassment literature, they did not examine contrapower sexual harassment. This paucity of research may be due to the frequency of contrapower sexual harassment often being minimized within the literature. For example, O'Donohue, Downs, and Yeater (1998) described their four-factor model of sexual harassment as having four preconditions "that must be met for sexual harassment to occur" (p. 116). One of these preconditions is overcoming victim resistance. O'Donohue et al. (1998) indicated that women who may have higher status positions or

positions of power are less likely to be sexually harassed. Even if sexual harassment among women who hold positions of power is less prevalent, it is important to note that this type of sexual harassment still occurs, with recipients enduring harm. As a result, outsiders may view contrapower sexual harassment as more acceptable, believing that the victim can take control of the situation because of her organizational power. If sexual harassment is condoned (through social norms and belief of traditional gender roles) or perpetrators believe they have a right to harass a person, regardless of formal power, then the contrapower harassment is less likely to stop. Therefore, assessing attitudes and perceptions toward this kind of harassment is critical.

If contrapower sexual harassment is seen as less serious or is less likely to be judged as sexual harassment in comparison to traditional sexual harassment, it may indicate that more work is needed to educate people with regard to contrapower sexual harassment. Benson (1984) suggests that the harassment of female professors by males is an extension of the power discrepancy that exists in society between men and women. As mentioned previously, if the victim is in a power position, what happens to her may not be viewed as negatively or even considered sexual harassment since the “person has power and responsibility to handle the situation” (McKinney, 1992, p. 641). Therefore, finding differences in perceptions of traditional sexual harassment and contrapower sexual harassment in a non-jury framework could prove beneficial. Furthermore, examining graduate students’ perceptions and attitudes of sexual harassment could also be advantageous due to their dual role as both student and teacher. This population is particularly useful because they can offer different viewpoints, depending on which role they identify with. Additionally, although undergraduate and faculty experiences with sexual harassment have been explored, few studies have focused on graduate students.

Factors Influencing Perceptions of Behaviour That Constitute Sexual Harassment

Researchers (Rospenda, Richman & Nawyn, 1998) have suggested that race, class, and sexual orientation also play a role in perceptions of sexual harassment. However, there is virtually no published research exploring these factors. Therefore the inclusion of these factors would be premature and exceeds the scope of this study. Although these variables are not examined closely in this study, the importance of these factors are recognized and should be carefully considered and incorporated in future studies. As indicated by Eagly and Kite (1987), characteristics of persons described in vignettes that remained unidentified (such as race and gender) result in participants classifying these characters as White and male. It is my contention therefore that with the characteristics such as the race of victims and harassers unspecified in the current study's scenarios, participants can be expected to assume that these characters are of the dominant groups (i.e., White, heterosexual).

Grauerholz (1989) states there are several factors that predict a person's vulnerability to sexual harassment including gender and status. Grauerholz stresses that female students are most susceptible to sexual harassment, however she also examined female professors' experiences with sexual harassment. She explored open-ended comments that female professors made (see Grauerholz, 1989 for a review), and discovered that though certain behaviours would be clearly classified as sexual harassment by researchers, respondents often did not see those same behaviours as sexual harassment. In addition, several professors thought any sexually harassing behaviours they were subject to did not count as sexual harassment because of their higher power status. McKinney (1990) discussed this phenomenon, suggesting that the position of the harasser and the circumstance may influence whether behaviours are considered sexual

harassment. Interestingly enough, Stockdale, Vaux, and Cashin (1995) also found similar results with participants less likely to acknowledge sexual harassment when the perpetrator was of lesser status than themselves. Stockdale, Vaux, and Cashin (1995) noted that when people generally do not acknowledge sexual harassment, victims are unlikely to recognize it as harassment, and chances are that others will not as well. This would result in less support for victims of contrapower sexual harassment, even though they would be experiencing similar effects of victimization as traditional sexual harassment victims. If victims do not recognize what has happened to them as sexual harassment they are less able to obtain support from others. This could have serious consequences. However, with limited research in this field, many of these results are still tentative and there is a need for further research.

The Current Study

The current study examined and compared graduate students' perceptions of traditional sexual harassment versus contrapower sexual harassment. Graduate students are in a special position within many institutions because of their dual role as both student and instructor. As Pryor (1985) suggests, perspective-taking or empathy skills might influence the attributions made in hypothetical scenarios. Pryor and Day (1988) asked participants to assume the perspective of either the perpetrator (male) or victim (female) when reading hypothetical sexual harassment scenarios. He found that the behaviour portrayed was perceived as more sexually harassing when participants took the viewpoint of the victim. McKinney (1992) also found that faculty judged student perpetrators as more responsible, regardless of sex or type of behaviour. Therefore, graduate students are in a unique position of possibly holding both roles simultaneously, perhaps allowing perspective shifts which would make their views particularly valuable. Whether or not a

graduate student has teaching experience may affect their identification with the victim of sexual harassment in both traditional and contrapower situations and consequently their perception of sexual harassment. Graduate students' experience as students may make them more aware of the vulnerability of students in traditional sexual harassment situations, but their teaching experience may give them a window into the potential vulnerability of the teacher role as well. This idea was speculative and was tested in the current study.

Pryor (1985) also suggests that one's attitudes toward feminism may affect their perceptions of sexual harassment, since feminists would be more likely to have "sexual harassment as a cognitive label for social-sexual behaviours" (p. 278). Attitudes toward feminism were therefore assessed. Attitudes toward sexual harassment are also central. Therefore, one would generally expect that one's overall attitude toward sexual harassment would significantly affect specific judgements of the scenarios. Gender may be more or equally important. Rotundo, Nguyen, and Sackett (2001) conducted a meta-analysis of 62 sexual harassment studies examining gender differences. They found that women were more likely to see a broader range of behaviours as sexual harassment. Support for the importance of gender in perceptions of sexual harassment has also been found in other studies (e.g., Gutek & O'Connor, 1995; Konrad & Gutek, 1986).

Hypotheses

Based on Rotundo, Nguyen, and Sackett's (2001) and Gutek's (Gutek & O'Connor, 1995; Konrad & Gutek, 1986) research, it was hypothesized that female participants would have less tolerant views than men of sexual harassment overall as measured by the Attitudes toward Sexual Harassment (SHAS) scale and in their ratings of all scenarios. It was hypothesized that there would be a main effect for type of harassment

with participants viewing traditional sexual harassment as more indicative of sexual harassment, attributing more responsibility to the harasser and less to the victim than in the contrapower sexual harassment conditions. In addition, it was hypothesized that there would be a main effect for the type of role the graduate student is presented in (harasser or victim) with participants more likely to perceive sexual harassment in scenarios in which the graduate student is a victim. However, it was expected that an interaction would take place between a participant's previous teaching experience and role of the graduate student.

Furthermore, individual difference variables were expected to have an impact on perceptions. It was expected that those with previous sexual harassment experience would be more likely to perceive the situation as sexual harassment compared to those without sexual harassment experience. Additionally, participants with more feminist beliefs and those with more negative attitudes toward sexual harassment would be more likely to perceive a situation as sexual harassment and assign more responsibility to the perpetrator and less to the victim than those less supportive of feminist beliefs and with less negative attitudes toward sexual harassment. Therefore, the primary aim of this study was to assess whether judgements are affected by the type of harassment and a graduate student's role above and beyond general attitudes.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 76 male and 95 female graduate students from various faculties at the University of Windsor. These participants represent approximately 29% of the 595 surveys distributed. One participant did not indicate his or her gender, and three participants did not identify their age. Participant age ranged from 22 to 50 ($M = 28.22$, $SD = 5.61$). The majority of the participants were Caucasian (62%), with a sizable minority of participants indicating an Asian ethnicity (19%). All participants were eligible to enter into a 100 dollar draw.

Materials

A self-report survey package was used to gather the data. The package included one sexual harassment scenario (experimental stimuli), questions regarding the experimental stimuli (dependent measures), the Attitudes toward Feminism and the Women's Movement scale (FWM), the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ), the Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale (SHAS), as well as demographic questions. The experimental stimuli and dependent measures were presented first to prevent priming effects. The order for the measures that followed was randomly chosen and remained the same for all surveys.

Experimental Stimuli. Hypothetical sexual harassment scenarios were adapted from McKinney's 1992 study. Details that may have confounded perceptions of sexual harassment (such as age, attractiveness, and student's academic grade) were removed from the original scenarios. The basic scenario describes a sexual harassment situation between a student and a professor. The independent variable, type of harassment, was manipulated by having the harassment come from an instructor towards a student

(traditional harassment situation in which an undergraduate student is sexually harassed by a graduate student/instructor or a graduate student is sexually harassed by a faculty member) or by having the harassment come from a student towards an instructor (contrapower sexual harassment in which a graduate student/instructor is sexually harassed by an undergraduate student or a faculty member is sexually harassed by a graduate student). The independent variable of role of graduate student was manipulated by describing the graduate student as either the perpetrator (graduate student is harassing an undergraduate student or a faculty member) or victim (a graduate student/instructor is sexually harassed by an undergraduate student or a faculty member.) For the full vignette, see Appendix A.

Perceptions of Sexual Harassment and Responsibility. Three questions developed by McKinney (1992) were adapted in the present study. The first question assessed whether in the participant's opinion the incident constitutes sexual harassment ("In your opinion, does the incident described constitute sexual harassment?"). This question was adapted to add "in your opinion" since a definition of sexual harassment was not provided for participants. A 7-point Likert response scale was used (ranging from 1 = definitely is to 7 = definitely is not). Lower scores therefore demonstrate that participants believe the scenario is more indicative of sexual harassment. Participants were also asked to assess responsibility of both the perpetrator and victim ("How much responsibility for the incident belongs to the student?" and "How much responsibility for the incident belongs to the faculty member?"). For the two questions assessing responsibility of the perpetrator and victim, a 7-point Likert response scale was used (ranging from 1=not at all responsible to 7=completely responsible). Higher scores therefore represent more responsibility for the perpetrator and the victim.

Attitudes Toward Feminism. Attitudes toward feminism were assessed by Fassinger's (1994) Attitudes toward Feminism and the Women's Movement (FWM) Scale (see Appendix B). The FWM scale is a 10-item questionnaire using a 5-point Likert response scale. Reliability is high with alpha equal to .89 (Fassinger, 1994). Correlations between the FWM scale and other relevant instruments indicate good construct validity (Fassinger, 1994). Higher scores indicate more support for the women's movement.

Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale (SHAS). Attitudes toward sexual harassment were assessed by using Mazer and Percival's (1989) attitude index. It has also been used extensively in previous research, and the SHAS is an extension of the 10-item Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory (TSHI) comparing satisfactorily with the TSHI. Internal consistency is satisfactory with an alpha of .84 (Mazer & Percival, 1989). The questionnaire has 19 items asking about beliefs and tolerance of sexual harassment in academia as well as about the level of agreement with feminist conceptions of harassment (see Appendix D). The index uses a 5-point Likert response scale (1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree). Higher scores indicate more tolerance of sexual harassment.

Sexual Experiences Questionnaire. Experiences with sexual harassment were measured by the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) (Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995). The SEQ is designed to identify the frequency of gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. The questionnaire consists of 20 items asking if each behaviour was experienced (ranging from 0 = never to 4 = most of the time) and requesting information on the sex of the perpetrator (see Appendix C). However, the final item ("Have you ever been in a situation where you have been sexually harassed?") was not scored with the rest of the scale since it was considered a criterion item. Internal consistency is high with an alpha of .92 (Fitzgerald et al., 1988).

Research measuring the validity of the SEQ has provided equivocal results. However, good validity is reported by Arvey and Cavanaugh (1995). An adapted scale developed by Solylo-Pasek (1994) was used. It adds questions about peer harassment (with another graduate student) and contrapower harassment (involving an undergraduate student) for each behaviour, restricting participant experiences to those occurring as a University of Windsor graduate student. To make the questionnaire gender neutral, some questions were adapted (e.g., replacing the word “breast” with “chest”). Scoring for the three types of harassment is accomplished by summing item responses and dividing them by the number of items on each scale to produce a scale score. Scores on each subscale therefore range between 0 and 4 with higher scores indicating higher frequency of experiences.

Demographic Questions. Participants were asked several demographic and background questions, some of which were developed by Solylo-Pasek (1994). These questions included participant age, ethnicity, sex, department, and whether the participant had any teaching experience. Teaching experience was defined as whether or not they had any contact with students by lecturing or teaching a tutorial. (See Appendix E).

Procedure

Emails were sent out to all graduate students at the University of Windsor through the Registrar’s office to explain the study and forewarn them of the survey that may arrive in their mailbox. The email also explained the random selection procedures. (See Appendix F). An introductory letter has been shown to increase response rates in mail out studies (Dillman, 1991). The Registrar’s office then randomly distributed questionnaire packages to 595 graduate student mailboxes. A reminder email of the survey was sent two weeks later.

Each package contained the letter of information describing the study and identifying the researchers involved. The letter of information about the study replaced a consent form. Students were told that completing and mailing back the survey constituted consent (see Appendix G for Letter of Information). There were two envelopes in the questionnaire package; One large return envelope for returning the completed questionnaire, and the other small envelope had a draw slip inside, which participants must have filled out with their name and contact information and returned in the small envelope in order to be entered into a draw of 100 dollars. Intra-university mail was used for all returns. To maintain confidentiality, the researcher was not responsible for the draw. The graduate secretary of the Department of Psychology received all draw ballots and was responsible for picking the winning ballot. The researcher then notified the winner and distributed the prize money. A website address with a list of resources concerning sexual harassment policies and support information was provided. Feedback will be provided on the University REB website once the findings are finalized (Fall 2005).

Results

Reliability of all measures

Internal consistency was established for all of the scales used in the study. The reliability coefficients are listed in Table 1. Internal consistency as measured using Cronbach's alphas was satisfactory (above .73) for all measures. Means, standard deviations, and ranges of scores are also presented. With respect to the SEQ, scores were broken down into the subscales of Gender Harassment, Unwanted Sexual Attention, and Sexual Coercion.

Background Variables

Before proceeding with the primary analyses, the following characteristics of the sample were examined. The majority of participants were from the Department of Psychology (19%), a collection of the Engineering departments (15%) and the department of Chemistry/Biochemistry (8%). Eleven participants did not identify their department. For a comparison of the total number of graduate students per department to participants per department, see Table 2. One hundred and eighteen (69%) participants indicated they had some teaching experience (lecture or tutorial) while 52 (30%) participants indicated that either their graduate assistant duties did not include teaching or they were not graduate assistants. Two participants did not identify whether they held graduate assistantships or any graduate assistant duties.

Preliminary Analyses

Many participants indicated they had experienced some type of sexual harassment behaviour based on their SEQ responses. The SEQ scale was dichotomized to reflect that either participants did or did not experience any sexually harassing behaviours (see Table 3). However, based on the final criterion item of the SEQ, only a very small number of

Table 1

Reliability Coefficients, Scale Means, and Scale Standard Deviations and Ranges

Measure	Alpha	Mean	Standard Deviation	Possible Range	Actual Range
SHAS	.88	47.81	11.95	19-95	21-76
FWM	.73	34.47	6.22	10-50	20-49
SEQ					
Gender Harassment	.86	.51	.49	0-4	0-3.07
Unwanted Sexual Attention	.89	.16	.26	0-4	0-1.26
Sexual Coercion	.77	.12	.09	0-4	0-1.00

Note. SHAS = Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale. FWM = Attitudes toward Feminism and the Women's Movement. SEQ = Sexual Experiences Questionnaire.

Table 2

Participants per Department in Comparison to Total Graduate Students per Department

Department	Number of Full-time Graduate Students	
	Study (% of total)	Actual
Biological Sciences	9 (19%)	48
Business	3 (2%)	178
Civil and Environmental Engineering	6 (9%)	65
Chemistry and Biochemistry	13 (22%)	58
Communication Studies	4 (18%)	22
Computer Science	6 (7%)	92
Earth Sciences	4 (2%)	19
Economics	2 (7%)	29
Education	7 (22%)	32
Electrical and Computer Engineering	10 (17%)	59
English	4 (13%)	32
Great Lakes Institute and Environmental Research	5 (28%)	18
History	6 (35%)	17
Human Kinetics	11 (20%)	54
Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering	1 (3%)	30
Mathematics and Statistics	3 (8%)	36
Mechanical, Automotive, and Materials Engineering	9 (16%)	55
Nursing	2 (67%)	3
Philosophy	1 (8%)	12
Physics	5 (19%)	27
Political Science	6 (17%)	35
Psychology	33 (31%)	106
Sociology/Anthropology	10 (23%)	44
Visual Arts	1 (10%)	10

Table 3

Occurrence of Sexual Harassment

Type of Harassment	n (%)	
	Never	Once or More
Gender Harassment (5 items)		
Professors	70 (49%)	102 (59%)
Graduate Students	40 (23%)	132 (77%)
Undergraduate Students ^a	67 (40%)	104 (60%)
Unwanted Sexual Attention (9 items)		
Professors	128 (74%)	44 (26%)
Graduate Students	95 (55%)	77 (45%)
Undergraduate Students ^a	108 (63%)	64 (37%)
Sexual Coercion (5 items)		
Professors	168 (98 %)	4 (2%)
Graduate Students	163 (95%)	9 (5%)
Undergraduate Students ^a	170 (99 %)	2 (1%)

Note. N = 172.

^aThese experiences constitute contrapower sexual harassment.

participants indicated that they had been sexually harassed. Six (3.5%) participants indicated they had been sexually harassed by professors, 13 (7.6%) participants indicated they had been sexually harassed by graduate students, and seven (4%) participants indicated they had been sexual harassed by undergraduate students. The SEQ was designed in part because people do not label their experiences according to legal or research definitions; therefore the unlabelled responses in Table 3 are more indicative of experience levels.

A correlation matrix was computed in order to determine if any attitudinal or experience measures (SEQ, FWM, SHAS) were correlated with the dependent variables of perpetrator responsibility ratings, victim responsibility ratings, and the degree to which the incident constituted sexual harassment (see Table 4). Since I was primarily interested in traditional and contrapower sexual harassment, and the scenario given to participants involved unwanted sexual attention, I used participants' experiences of unwanted sexual attention from professors and undergraduate students in the analyses. Since sexual harassment (unwanted sexual attention) by professors was not significantly correlated with the dependent variables, it was dropped from further analyses.

Effects of gender on ratings

To test my hypothesis that female participants would have less tolerant views overall than men of sexual harassment as measured by SHAS scores and in their ratings of all scenarios, independent samples t-tests were conducted between gender and SHAS scores, and gender with the ratings of the scenarios. Using a Bonferroni correction ($p = .0125$) for multiple tests, there was a significant difference between males and females for the SHAS scores. Therefore, it was confirmed that female participants had less tolerant views of sexual harassment than male participants. However, there was no significant

Table 4

Intercorrelations Between Dependent Variables, Independent Variables, and Covariates

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Degree to Which the											
2. Perpetrator Responsibility	-.391**	--									
3. Victim Responsibility	.322**	-.683**	--								
4. Teaching Experience	.064	-.046	-.027	--							
5. Role of Graduate Student	.030	.100	.001	-.055	--						
6. Type of SH	.254**	-.115	.097	.023	.038	--					
7. Gender	-.151*	.163*	-.123	.083	.008	.081	--				
8. FWM	-.192*	.250**	-.333**	-.221**	-.026	.120	.396*	--			
9. SHAS	.338**	-.269**	.331**	-.223**	-.022	-.043	-.499**	-	--		
10. SEQ – Unwanted Sexual Attention by Professors	.047	.050	-.062	.008	-.028	.113	.093	.134	-.074	--	
11. SEQ – Unwanted Sexual Attention by Undergraduate Students	.160*	-.020	.127	.116	.066	.000	.047	-.061	.049	.236**	--

Note. SHAS = Sexual Harassment Attitudes Scale.

^an = 75. ^bn = 95.

***p < .001.

difference between males' and females' ratings of victim responsibility, perpetrator responsibility, or the degree to which the scenario constituted sexual harassment. Refer to Table 5 for means, standard deviations, t-values, and effect sizes.

Relationship of Attitudes to Perceptions of Sexual Harassment

To understand the role of attitudes and previous sexual harassment experience and to test the prediction that participants with more feminist beliefs, more negative attitudes toward sexual harassment, and more sexual harassment experience would perceive all the scenarios as more indicative of sexual harassment, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted. Gender, SHAS, FWM, and SEQ scores were predictors of the degree to which the incident constituted sexual harassment. Gender was entered into the model in the first block, and SHAS scores, FWM scores, and SEQ scores were entered into the model in the second block. Results of assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were satisfactory.

The linear combination of gender, SHAS, FWM, and SEQ scores was significantly related to perceptions of sexual harassment. Gender was a significant predictor of perceptions of sexual harassment accounting for 3% of the variance in the degree to which the incident was perceived to constitute sexual harassment (See Table 6). SHAS, FWM, and SEQ scores contributed significantly to the explanation of variance in the model beyond gender. Attitudes and experiences accounted for an additional 11% of variance. A closer examination of squared semi partial correlations revealed that SHAS ($sr^2 = .07, p < .001$) and SEQ ($sr^2 = .02, p < .05$) were the only variables to contribute uniquely to the prediction of the degree to which the incident was perceived as constituting sexual harassment. Sexual harassment attitudes predicted 7% of variance and

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations and Significant Values on Key Variables

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Cohen's <i>d</i>
SHAS			7.47***	1.15
Total Sample	47.81	11.95		
Males ^a	55.00	10.01		
Females ^b	43.34	10.19		
Degree to Which the Incident Constitutes Sexual Harassment			1.99	.30
Total Sample	2.95	1.70		
Males ^a	3.25	1.78		
Females ^b	2.74	1.61		
Perpetrator Responsibility Ratings			-2.07	.33
Total Sample	6.27	1.02		
Males ^a	6.08	1.18		
Females ^b	6.41	.85		
Victim Responsibility Ratings			1.74	.24
Total Sample	1.94	1.25		
Males ^a	2.12	1.14		
Females ^b	1.80	1.13		

Note. SHAS = Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale.

^a *n* = 75. ^b *n* = 95.

****p* < .001.

Table 6

Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Gender (Block 1) and Gender, SHAS, FWM, and SEQ (Block 2) on the Degree to Which the Incident Constitutes Sexual Harassment

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Step 1			
Gender	-.55	.26	-.16*
Step 2			
Gender	-.04	.29	-.01
SHAS	.05	.01	.33***
FWM	.00	.02	.01
SEQ	.88	.44	.15*

Note. $R^2 = .03$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .11$ for Step 2

* $p < .05$ *** $p < .001$

previous sexual harassment experience predicted 2% of the variance in sexual harassment judgements when gender and feminist beliefs are held constant. Those with more tolerant attitudes toward sexual harassment and more sexual harassment experience were less likely to perceive sexual harassment in scenarios.

To test the hypothesis that participants with more negative attitudes toward sexual harassment would assign more responsibility to the perpetrator, a hierarchical regression analysis was performed. Gender, along with FWM and SHAS scores were utilized as predictors while the responsibility ratings of the perpetrator served as the criterion variable. Gender was once again entered into the first block, while FWM and SHAS scores were entered into the second block. Gender was a significant predictor of perpetrator ratings of responsibility, accounting for 3.5% of the variance (See Table 7). Together, SHAS and FWM scores contributed significantly to the explanation of the variance to the model beyond gender, accounting for an additional 5% of variance. However, a closer examination of squared semi partial correlations reveals that while attitudes did improve prediction of responsibility ratings of the perpetrator, the three independent variables did not uniquely contribute to the dependent variable, although SHAS demonstrated a marginal relationship to responsibility ratings of the perpetrator.

To test the hypothesis that participants with more negative attitudes toward sexual harassment would assign less responsibility to the victim, a hierarchical regression analysis was performed. Once again gender, in addition to FWM and SHAS scores were utilized as predictors and responsibility ratings of the victim fulfilled the criterion variable. Gender was entered into the first block, while FWM and SHAS scores were entered into the second block (see Table 8). Gender was not a significant predictor of

Table 7

*Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Gender (Block 1) and Gender, SHAS, and FWM
(Block 2) on Responsibility Ratings of the Perpetrator*

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Step 1			
Gender	.37	.15	.19*
Step 2			
Gender	.10	.17	.05
SHAS	-.02	.01	-.18
FWM	.02	.01	.13

Note. $R^2 = .04$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .05$ for Step 2

* $p < .05$

Table 8

*Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Gender (Block 1) and Gender, SHAS, and FWM
(Block 2) on Responsibility Ratings of the Victim*

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Step 1			
Gender	-.31	.19	-.12
Step 2			
Gender	.25	.21	.10
SHAS	-.05	.02	-.24**
FWM	.03	.01	.25**

Note. $R^2 = .02$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .14$ for Step 2

** $p < .01$

victim ratings of responsibility, although it accounted for 1.5% of the variance.

Together, SHAS and FWM scores contributed significantly to the explanation of the variance in the model beyond gender, accounting for 14% of variance. A closer examination of squared semi partial correlations reveals that SHAS ($sr^2 = .04$, $p < .01$) and FWM ($sr^2 = .04$, $p < .01$) contributed uniquely to the prediction of the responsibility assigned to the victim. When gender was held constant, the more negative attitudes were towards sexual harassment and the more positive attitudes were towards feminism, the less responsibility was assigned to the victim by participants.

Effect of Type of Harassment, Role, Gender, and Teaching Experience

Three Analyses of Covariance (ANCOVA) were conducted. These analyses were conducted to determine if gender, teaching experience (yes/no), type of harassment in scenario (traditional/contrapower), and role of graduate student in scenario (victim/perpetrator) had an impact on the dependent variables of perpetrator responsibility ratings, victim responsibility ratings, and the degree to which the incident constituted sexual harassment. Since FWM and SHAS scores were found to be significantly correlated with the dependent variables, these measures were used as covariates in all ANCOVAs. The SEQ scores were correlated with the degree to which the incident constituted sexual harassment (but were not correlated with the other two dependent variables) therefore it was only included in the ANCOVA with the first dependent variable. Assumptions of normality of sampling distributions, linearity, and reliability of covariates were satisfactory.

Perceptions of Sexual Harassment. The first 2 (gender) x 2 (teaching experience) x 2 (type of harassment) x 2 (role of graduate student) ANCOVA with the degree to

which the incident constituted sexual harassment (see Table 9 for full details) revealed a main effect of type of harassment. Participants rated traditional sexual harassment (SH) scenarios ($M = 2.61$, $SD = 1.67$) as more indicative of SH than contrapower SH scenarios ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 1.60$). There was also a main effect of teaching experience, such that participants without teaching experience ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.62$) rated scenarios as less indicative of sexual harassment than participants with teaching experience ($M = 2.76$, $SD = 1.72$). There was also a three-way interaction of role, teaching experience, and gender. Five pairwise comparisons with an adjusted alpha of .01 revealed one simple effect. There was a significant difference between male participants with and without teaching experience in the condition where the graduate student was the victim. In the graduate student victim condition, male participants without teaching experience rated the scenario as less indicative of SH ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 1.65$) than male participants with teaching experience ($M = 2.40$, $SD = 1.63$). This difference is even more pronounced psychologically perhaps because males without teaching experience crossed the mid-point of the scale (3.5) to suggest this was *not* sexual harassment. Figure 1 illustrates the interactions with 2 two-way (Teaching Experience x Role of Graduate Student) interactions, separated for males and females.

While one would think that responsibility of the perpetrator ratings and responsibility of the victim ratings should be perfectly inversely related, participants' responses revealed that this was not always the case (see Table 4 for correlations). Therefore, even though the dependent variables of perpetrator responsibility ratings and victim responsibility ratings were correlated, two separate ANCOVAs were performed.

Table 9

Analysis of Covariance for the Degree to Which the Incident Constitutes Sexual Harassment

Source	df	F	ω^2	p
Type of SH	1	11.30***	.06	.001
Teaching Experience	1	4.98*	.02	.027
Gender	1	.02	.00	.884
Role	1	.16	.00	.687
Gender x Type of SH	1	2.45	.01	.120
Gender x Teaching Experience	1	.07	.01	.792
Gender x Role	1	1.31	.00	.254
Type of SH x Teaching Experience	1	.237	.00	.627
Type of SH x Role	1	.04	.01	.834
Teaching Experience x Role	1	3.60	.02	.060
Gender x Type of SH x Teaching Experience	1	.57	.00	.452
Gender x Type of SH x Role	1	.71	.00	.402
Type of SH x Teaching Experience x Role	1	.29	.00	.588
Gender x Teaching Experience x Role	1	4.95*	.02	.028
Gender x Type of SH x Teaching Experience x Role	1	1.73	.00	.191
SHAS	1	15.22***	.08	.000
FWM	1	.12	.01	.729
SEQ	1	2.84	.01	.094
S within group error	149	(2.22)		

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square error. *S* = subjects. SH = Sexual harassment.

* $p < .05$ *** $p < .001$

Figure 1. The interactive effect of gender, role of graduate student and teaching experience on perceptions of sexual harassment

The similar results for the two ANCOVAs will first be discussed together to decrease repetitiveness. Then the unique results for each ANCOVA will be discussed in turn.

Perpetrator and Victim Responsibility. The second and third ANCOVAs using the same independent variables (gender, teaching experience, type of harassment, and role of graduate student) and covariates (SHAS and FWM) were conducted with the dependent variables of ratings of perpetrator responsibility and ratings of victim responsibility, respectively. For both analyses, there was a main effect of type of harassment. Analyses indicated that subjects assigned more blame to the perpetrator in traditional SH scenarios ($M = 6.34, SD = 4.02$) than in contrapower SH scenarios ($M = 5.96, SD = .96$).

Conversely, less responsibility was apportioned to the victim in traditional SH scenarios ($M = 1.79, SD = 1.26$) as compared to contrapower SH scenarios ($M = 2.27, SD = 1.26$).

Both analyses also revealed a significant three-way interaction of role, teaching experience, and gender. When examining the ANCOVA using perpetrator responsibility as the dependent variable, four pairwise comparisons using a critical value of .0125, revealed three simple effects. Male participants (who had no teaching experience) who read the graduate student victim scenario exhibited different responses than three other groups of participants. For scenarios in which the victim was a graduate student, male participants without teaching experience ($M = 4.92, SD = 1.85$) designated less responsibility to the perpetrator as compared to those with prior teaching experience ($M = 6.40, SD = 1.06$) and females without teaching experience ($M = 6.49, SD = .60$).

Similarly, males reporting no teaching experience who were assigned to the graduate student victim condition, ($M = 4.92, SD = 1.85$) found the perpetrator to be less accountable than males assigned to the graduate student harasser condition ($M = 6.28, SD$

= .97). Figure 2 provides an illustration of the 2 two-way (Teaching Experience x Role of Graduate Student) interactions, for males and females in relation to perceived perpetrator responsibility. Similarly, in the analysis on responsibility ratings assigned to the victim there was (via simple effects) a significant difference between male participants who were assigned to the graduate student victim condition. Specifically, when scenarios portrayed the graduate student as the victim, males without teaching experience ($M = 2.98, SD = 1.85$) found the victim to be more accountable than males who had teaching experience ($M = 1.39, SD = 1.85$). Figure 3 shows 2 two-way interactions for males and females examining victim responsibility.

Perpetrator Responsibility. The analysis with perpetrator responsibility ratings as the dependent variable) also had a main effect of teaching experience (See Table 10). Participants without teaching experience assigned less responsibility to the perpetrator ($M = 5.94, SD = 1.19$) than participants with prior teaching backgrounds ($M = 6.36, SD = .89$). Although a two-way interaction of teaching experience and gender was discovered, it will not be discussed extensively since the three-way interaction of role, teaching experience, and gender subsumes it and has already been discussed (see Figure 2). In short, male participants without teaching experience ($M = 6.00, SD = 1.63$) assigned less responsibility to perpetrator than both male participants with teaching experience ($M = 6.40, SD = .94$) and female participants without teaching experience ($M = 6.29, SD = .62$). In addition, a two-way interaction involving gender and role of graduate student was also found, revealing that male participants who read the graduate student victim scenario assigned less responsibility to the perpetrator ($M = 5.66, SD = 1.45$) compared to males presented with the graduate student harasser scenario ($M = 6.35, SD = .87$) and females

Figure 2. The interactive effect of gender, teaching experience, and role of graduate student on perpetrator responsibility ratings

Figure 3. The interactive effect of gender, role of graduate student, and teaching experience on victim responsibility ratings

Table 10

Analysis of Covariance for Responsibility of Perpetrator Ratings

Source	df	F	ω^2	p
Type of SH	1	5.27*	.02	.023
Teaching Experience	1	6.20*	.03	.014
Gender	1	2.39	.01	.124
Role	1	2.83	.01	.094
Gender x Teaching Experience	1	5.64*	.03	.019
Gender x Role	1	6.24*	.03	.014
Teaching Experience x Role	1	1.60	.00	.207
Gender x Type of SH	1	2.61	.01	.108
Teaching Experience x Type of SH	1	1.47	.00	.2228
Role x Type of SH	1	.00	.01	.989
Role x Gender x Teaching Experience	1	8.01**	.04	.005
Gender x Teaching Experience x Type of SH	1	3.41	.01	.067
Gender x Role x Type of SH	1	.14	.01	.710
Teaching Experience x Role x Type of SH	1	.20	.00	.654
Gender x Teaching Experience x Role x Type of SH	1	.35	.00	.554
SHAS	1	3.52	.01	.063
FWM	1	2.43	.01	.121
S within group error	149	(.83)		

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square error. *S* = subjects. SH = Sexual harassment.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

presented with the graduate student victim scenario ($M = 6.37$, $SD = .81$).

Victim Responsibility. For the analysis with victim responsibility ratings, two 3-way interactions were found (see Table 11). The interaction of role, gender, and teaching experience was previously discussed. The interaction between the type of SH, gender, and role was also significant. Simple effects using an alpha of .0125 revealed that when examining the data for males without teaching experience, those in the contrapower SH condition ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.90$) assigned more responsibility to the victim than individuals placed in the traditional SH condition ($M = 1.55$, $SD = 1.33$). In addition, when males were presented with the contrapower SH scenarios, those without teaching experience typically viewed the victim as more responsible ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.90$) compared to males with teaching experience ($M = 1.68$, $SD = 1.32$). Figure 4 displays 2 two-way interactions of gender, teaching experience and type of SH when examining victim responsibility.

Table 11

Analysis of Covariance for Responsibility of Victim Ratings

Source	df	F	ω^2	p
Type of SH	1	5.83*	.03	.017
Teaching Experience	1	2.60	.01	.109
Gender	1	.29	.00	.589
Role	1	.88	.00	.349
Gender x Teaching Experience	1	2.39	.01	.124
Gender x Role	1	1.54	.00	.217
Teaching Experience x Role	1	2.46	.01	.119
Gender x Type of SH	1	2.23	.01	.138
Teaching Experience x Type of SH	1	1.48	.00	.226
Role x Type of SH	1	.00	.01	.994
Type of SH x Gender x Teaching Experience	1	5.41*	.03	.021
Role x Gender x Teaching Experience	1	10.25**	.05	.002
Gender x Role x Type of SH	1	.56	.00	.458
Teaching Experience x Role x Type of SH	1	.27	.00	.604
Gender x Teaching Experience x Role x Type of SH	1	3.36	.02	.069
SHAS	1	8.34**	.04	.004
FWM	1	8.35**	.04	.004
S within group error	149	(1.25)		

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square error. *S* = subjects. SH = Sexual harassment.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Figure 4. The interactive effect of gender, type of sexual harassment, and teaching experience on victim responsibility ratings

Discussion

This study approached the issue of sexual harassment, and more specifically contrapower sexual harassment, from a feminist perspective. From this perspective, gender is a critical power axis on which social relations are organized. This theory predicts that men and women will experience the world differently, particularly in social circumstances of power imbalances. The results of this study support a feminist explanation of sexual harassment.

In line with previous research (Gutek, 1995; Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2001), attitudes toward sexual harassment were found to be affected by gender, with women having less tolerant views of sexual harassment than men. Gender differences in attitudes are meaningful because they suggest that men and women have different experiences in our society, which make women more aware of and more sensitive to situations that are unequal. Gender was also found to interact with other variables in predicting reactions to the sexual harassment scenarios and ratings of victims and perpetrators.

When individual differences were examined, gender, attitudes (sexual harassment attitudes and attitudes toward feminism), and previous sexual harassment experience, were all crucial to perceptions of sexual harassment. Participants holding more negative sexual harassment attitudes, stronger feminist beliefs, and those with less sexual harassment experience were more likely to perceive the scenarios as sexual harassment. Although gender on its own was predictive of the views held by participants' toward scenarios involving sexual harassment, when attitudes and sexual harassment experience were examined, gender lost its explanatory power. Therefore, when gender and feminist beliefs were held constant, those holding more tolerant attitudes toward sexual

harassment and those having had more sexual harassment experience were less likely to perceive sexual harassment in scenarios where it was being depicted.

While the attitude findings are logical, the experience finding is at first counterintuitive. One might have expected prior experience to make one more aware of sexual harassment. However, it appears that exposure to sexual harassment may have desensitized participants. Literature focusing on other forms of sexual violence against women can lend support for this explanation of the phenomenon through an exploration on the impact of sexual harassment on its victims (Koss, 1990; O'Donohue, Downs & Yeater, 1998). One of the symptoms described is emotional numbing or desensitization. This could perhaps explain responses for those participants who had experienced sexual harassment. It could be that these participants were so accustomed to experiencing sexual harassment that they were no longer as able to recognize and label those behaviours as sexual harassment in the given scenarios. This idea is similar to the “dripping tap” phenomenon proposed by Wise and Stanley (1987), who suggest that sexual harassment becomes so pervasive in women's everyday lives that we simply learn to live with it and become used to it. This is another potential negative consequence of sexual harassment that needs further exploration.

The primary purpose of this study was to examine graduate students' judgements and perceptions of sexual harassment based on the type of sexual harassment depicted. In addition, it was hypothesized that perceptions of sexual harassment and attributions of responsibility (to the perpetrator and victim) would be directly affected by variables such as gender, prior teaching experience, and role of graduate student in the scenario. Most individuals in society do not hold/share a feminist perspective so it was predicted that an

organizational way of looking at the various types of sexual harassment would predominate in people's perceptions and this was supported by the findings.

Wayne (2000) reasoned that the organizational model (based on organizational hierarchy) could explain less negative perceptions of contrapower harassment, however, results from her study contradicted this suggestion. Specifically, the contrapower harassment scenarios were found to be most unwelcome, with contrapower harassers being rated as more guilty as compared to the perpetrators in the traditional and peer situations. In order to explain her results, Wayne used the role-discrepant model. In particular, the role-discrepant model coincided with the results, showing that male subordinates harassing females holding higher positions of power were viewed as more "out of character" from their typical role of a subordinate.

The current study's results differed from those gathered by Wayne (2000). Although the type of sexual harassment did play a pivotal role in the perceptions of the participants, my results indicated that contrapower sexual harassment was perceived less as sexual harassment than traditional sexual harassment. In addition, participants generally assigned more responsibility to the perpetrator within the traditional sexual harassment scenario, whereas victims were evaluated as being more accountable for the contrapower harassment scenarios. These findings are also supported by research that contrasts traditional and peer harassment, where individuals consistently perceive peer harassment less negatively (Bursik, 1992; Ellis, Barak, & Pinto, 1991; Katz, Hannon, & Whitten, 1996). As a result, it appears that people generally view sexual harassment from an organizational model rather than a role-discrepant model perspective.

According to this organizational model, men, who hold positions of authority, demonstrate their power and dominance by sexually harassing women who hold subordinate positions. People typically react to these scenarios by formulating a traditional, organizational schema of sexual harassment. In other words, traditional sexual harassment is perceived more as sexual harassment since it corresponds to a greater degree with people's expectations. This is especially true considering that most individuals view hierarchies within an organization as the defining feature of sexual harassment. As a result, individuals who operate from an organizational model perspective may have a greater degree of difficulty identifying contrapower or peer sexual harassment. I believe that individuals are less able to recognize sexual harassment in contrapower or peer scenarios due to the fact that these scenarios often contradict their own schemas (persons of power harassing subordinates) of sexual harassment. Even when presented with clear cut contrapower harassment scenarios, individuals operating from the organizational model perspective may believe these scenarios are of less significance due to the perception that perpetrators are unable to manipulate a victim who is more empowered to confront harassment.

It is important to note that general conclusions regarding the usefulness of the organizational model in predicting perceptions of all types of sexual harassment may be premature. This is especially true given that the current study did not examine sexual harassment of male victims by female perpetrators. Therefore using the role-discrepant model of sexual harassment for explaining people's reactions to and perceptions of sexual harassment scenarios should not be entirely ruled out. However, considering that most lay people have been exposed to the traditional theories of sexual harassment, as opposed to

the feminist theories, the organizational model can be used as a plausible explanation of their perceptions of sexual harassment.

In addition to the confirmation of the hypothesis that there would be a difference between types of sexual harassment, I had also anticipated that participant's perceptions would be significantly affected by the role of the graduate student in the scenario and teaching experience. Indeed some of the most interesting findings emerged from these analyses. Those with teaching experience (i.e., contact with students) perceived scenarios depicting sexual harassment as more strongly indicative of sexual harassment than those without teaching experience. Those with teaching experience also found the perpetrator more accountable and the victim less accountable than those without teaching experience. Although gender and the role of graduate student in the scenario were not found to make a difference by themselves, teaching experience did interact with these variables.

In particular, males without teaching experience presented with the graduate student victim condition stood out the most from all other groups. What is it about this particular group that makes them perceive sexual harassment of female graduate students by male undergraduates less, assign less responsibility to the perpetrator and more responsibility to the victim? I would speculate that men without teaching experience are somehow less cognizant of the power dynamics at work in sexual harassment situations and are less sensitive to the feelings of vulnerability that occur among all other groups. Furthermore, since men are accustomed to living in a patriarchal society that benefits them, they are less cognizant of existing power differentials. As a result, when presented with contrapower scenarios, men without teaching experience may be less capable of identifying with the victim than they are with a previous role (male undergraduate

student). In contrast, women, regardless of their teaching experience, are more vulnerable and find themselves in subordinate positions because of the gender hierarchy that exists in society. In accordance with the feminist perspective, it is understandable why women would be more sensitive to any form of power differential, given the patriarchy in which we live. Men with teaching experience may become more aware of power. They have the dual role of being in a power position (teacher) and being in a subordinate position (student). In support of this speculation, several studies (e.g., Kelchtermans, 1993, 1996) have used a biographical perspective for teachers and found that when teachers reflected on their own personal experiences within the school setting, they often identified vulnerabilities within themselves, (e.g., doubting the quality of their work) thus lending support that men may be reflecting on different experiences of power. It may be possible to draw parallels to graduate assistants in order to explain the lack of identification (and the lack of vulnerability) exhibited by males without teaching experience.

In summary, all scenarios depicted behaviour that would be defined by researchers as sexual harassment (unwanted sexual attention). Graduate students viewed both types of situations below the midpoint of the rating scale suggesting that they perceived all of them as at least slightly indicative of sexual harassment. However, they viewed traditional situations of sexual harassment as more indicative of sexual harassment than the less common contrapower scenario. They also engaged in relatively more victim blaming in the contrapower versus the traditional sexual harassment scenario. Teaching experience was related to more accurate assessments of sexual harassment across the board. Additionally, teaching experience affected male graduate students' perceptions most, and

this was particularly evident in contrapower situations. Males with no teaching experience were less skilled at identifying sexual harassment when a graduate student was portrayed as a victim and they assigned less responsibility to the perpetrator when compared to men with teaching experience. Unsurprisingly then, the results indicated that males without teaching experience are less sensitive to contrapower sexual harassment as compared to their female counterparts. The fact that women were more conscious of power differentials may be a reflection of the gender inequality that consistently victimizes women within society.

In general, people take sexual harassment less seriously in situations involving contrapower sexual harassment. This situation has significant implications considering the lack of support provided by outsiders even though victims are subjected to similar levels of harm. In addition to receiving less support, victims may be less able to recognize that they have experienced sexual harassment. Furthermore, it may affect how they feel about themselves (self-blame), about the situation (recognizing sexual harassment), and about reporting sexual harassment to the authorities.

The results from this study also demonstrated that sexual harassment exists at the University of Windsor. More importantly, it indicated that graduate students have experienced sexual harassment (broadly defined) at the hands of professors (54%), fellow graduate students (77%), and even undergraduate students (60%). These statistics are disturbing given the negative impact that sexual harassment can have on its victims. More specifically, graduate students are at risk for emotional and academic impacts, resulting in such symptoms as depression, anxiety, and anger, in addition to decreased self-efficacy as both a student and potential professor. We know graduate students are experiencing

contrapower sexual harassment, with at least 60% of the sample at the University of Windsor having had this experience. When this fact is combined with the finding that contrapower sexual harassment is not taken as seriously as the more traditional form of sexual harassment, it is important for educational institutions to address and support victims of contrapower sexual harassment. As a result, a great deal of sensitivity needs to be directed toward this issue. This is especially important given that women not only have to overcome obstacles related to sexual harassment but also the power imbalance that continues to oppress women.

Based on the results, it can be suggested that most people do not in fact approach sexual harassment from a feminist perspective. Thus, the most common way of thinking and conceptualizing sexual harassment is through the traditional theories, which emphasize a power structure within an organization. So, while most people would perceive organizational hierarchy as being a key factor in sexual harassment, I am asserting that gendered power is in fact the most meaningful way to understand sexual harassment. Therefore, if more people adopt the feminist approach as a way of viewing sexual harassment, the awareness of the gendered power dimension would most likely increase. This last point provides support for the importance of educating others. In particular, increasing awareness of gendered power and educating others regarding the feminist view of sexual harassment may serve as an adaptive prevention technique.

In terms of prevention, people need to be educated on the most prevalent view of sexual harassment. While it can explain sexual harassment in some contexts, it fails to account for contrapower sexual harassment. It is necessary for this to be brought to the attention of the general public, given that a traditional view of sexual harassment can in

fact be damaging for those experiencing contrapower sexual harassment. Education programs focusing on enlightening people to the feminist approach are needed, and can hopefully alter individuals' perceptions of sexual harassment.

In addition, the implication that teaching experience may directly affect perceptions of sexual harassment is substantial. This may mean that educational institutions should focus on giving graduate students more teaching experience with appropriate training, to make them more capable of recognizing sexual harassment situations and better able to contribute to a supportive environment for victims of contrapower sexual harassment. Educational and awareness programs about contrapower sexual harassment may allow its victims to feel more supported, less at fault, and more importantly, let them know that they are not alone. A step in this direction could include a workshop highlighting the frequency of contrapower sexual harassment (in that it can happen to anyone), and identifying coping resources for those who have experienced it. These coping mechanisms along with the recognition that victims should not feel alone, may prove to be quite beneficial. This may be the first step in addressing the issue of contrapower sexual harassment. If more women and men are aware that this is happening, it may increase levels of reporting, and as a result, the negative consequences for the perpetrators. Given that a paucity of data currently exists that empirically examines contrapower sexual harassment, future replication is necessary. The current study was intended to be exploratory in nature and as a result, it has several limitations.

Limitations and Strengths of the Study and Future Directions

First, while the survey was sent to 575 potential participants, I only obtained a response rate of 29%. Although this percentage is not atypical for mail out surveys

(McKinney, 1990), a higher response rate would have increased statistical power and generalizability. In addition, the ability to generalize the findings is limited to University of Windsor graduate students since there is no way to know how specific these findings are to the region. While there is no reason to suspect that University of Windsor students are different, future studies should carefully consider collecting data across a variety of geographical locations and post-secondary institutions. In order to improve generalizability and ensure accuracy, larger and more diverse samples are needed. Finally, the variables of race, class, and sexual orientation were not explored in this study. Although previous literature has explored a plethora of variables, the aforementioned social variables have been understudied. Given the current results, I can only imagine that the inclusion of women of colour, lesbians, or poor women as victims would further exaggerate differences between groups (Shelton & Chavous, 1999; Sigal, Braden-Maguire, Patt, Goodrich, & Perrino, 2003). The impact that they may have on our perceptions of sexual harassment could be very important and further examination is needed.

The current study also has a number of strengths. In particular, by utilizing experimental control, I was able to minimize the risk of confounding variables (e.g., age, grade, attractiveness), thus lending greater validity to the results. Experimental control was also obtained by providing traditional sexual harassment scenarios in addition to contrapower sexual harassment scenarios. There was also an attempt at random sampling by randomly distributing the surveys to graduate student mailboxes across all departments, thus ensuring there could be equal representation across participants' gender and department and minimizing subject selection biases.

The current study provides support for the existence and prevalence of contrapower sexual harassment. As a result, contrapower sexual harassment has revealed itself to be a significant and pervasive issue within this university environment. The finding that less negative attitudes were in fact directed toward contrapower sexual harassment as compared to traditional sexual harassment has several important implications. Considering the maladaptive impact contrapower sexual harassment has on its victims (similar to other types of sexual harassment), much work is needed in order to educate people with regard to the prevention and possible elimination of contrapower sexual harassment. Although participants identified contrapower situations less as sexual harassment, it is important to note both scenarios *were* identified as sexual harassment. This finding is significant considering that 20 or 30 years ago this may have not been the case. Therefore, it appears as though feminist theory has made great strides in providing a greater awareness of sexual harassment. With this in mind, if contrapower sexual harassment continues to be examined and individuals are educated on how gendered power is the key determinant in its perpetration, change may in fact be possible. Perhaps putting a spotlight on these different forms of harassment (peer and contrapower) may increase awareness. By highlighting these issues on the occurrence of contrapower sexual harassment, it may help eradicate one form of violence against women.

References

- Adams, J.W., Kottke, J.L., & Padgett, J.S. (1983). Sexual harassment of university students. *Journal of College Personnel*, 484-491.
- Arvey, R. D., & Cavanaugh, M. A. (1995). Using surveys to assess the prevalence of sexual harassment: Some methodological problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51(1), 39-52.
- Benson, K. (1984). Comments on Crocker's "An analysis of university definitions of sexual harassment." *Signs*, 6, 516-519.
- Bursik, K. (1992). Perceptions of Sexual Harassment in an academic context. *Sex Roles*, 27, 401-412.
- Cammaert, L. P. (1985). How widespread is sexual harassment on campus? *International Journal of Women's Studies*, 8, 388-397.
- Cleveland, J., & Kerst, M. (1993). Sexual harassment and perceptions of power: An underarticulated relationship. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42, 49-67.
- Crocker, P. L. (1983). An analysis of university definitions of sexual harassment. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 8, 696-707.
- Dansky, B. S., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (1997). Effects of sexual harassment. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.) *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (p. 151 – 174). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- DeSouza, E. & Fansler, A.G. (2003). Contrapower sexual harassment: A survey of students and faculty members. *Sex Roles*, 48, 529 – 542.
- Dillman, D.A. (1991). The design and administration of mail surveys. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17, 225-249.

- Dzeich, B. W., & Weiner, L. (1984). *The lecherous professor: Sexual harassment on campus*. Boston: Beacon.
- Ellis, S., Barak, A., & Pinto, A. (1991). Moderating effects of personal cognitions on experienced and perceived sexual harassment of women at the workplace. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 1320-1337.
- Fassinger, R. (1994). Development and testing of the Attitudes toward Feminism and the Women's Movement (FWM) Scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18, 389-402.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychological advances. *Basic and Applied Psychology*, 17, 425-446.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Shullman, Bailey, Richard, Swecker, Gold, Ormerod, Weitzman (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 152-175.
- Gelfand, M.J., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The structure of sexual harassment: A confirmatory analysis across cultures and settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 47, 164-177.
- Grauerholz, F. (1989). Sexual harassment of women professors by students: Exploring the dynamics of power, authority and gender in a university setting. *Sex Roles*, 21, 789-801.
- Gruber, J.E. (1990). Methodological problems and policy implications in sexual harassment research. *Populations Research and Policy Review*, 9, 235-254.
- Gruber, J.E. (1997). An epidemiology of sexual harassment: Evidence from North

- America and Europe. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, & treatment* (pp. 84-98). Boston, Allyn & Bacon.
- Gutek, B. (1985). *Sex and the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gutek, B., & Koss, M. P. (1993). Changed women and changed organizations: Consequences of and coping with sexual harassment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42*, 28-48.
- Gutek, B., & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex-ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*, 55-74.
- Gutek, B., & O'Connor, M. (1995). The empirical basis for the reasonable woman standard. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*, 151-166.
- Hoffman, F. L. (1986). Sexual harassment in academia: Feminist theory and institutional practice. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*, 105-121.
- Katz, R. C., Hannon, R., & Whitten, L. (1996). Effects of gender and situation on the perception of sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 34*, 35-42.
- Kelchtermans, G. (1996). Teacher vulnerability: Understanding its moral and political roots. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 26*, 307-323.
- Kelchtermans, G. (1993). Getting the story, understanding the lives: From career stories to teachers' professional development. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 9*, 443-456.
- Konrad, A.M., & Gutek, B.A. (1986). Impact of work experiences on attitudes toward sexual harassment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31*, 422-438.
- Koss, M. P. (1990). Changed lives: The psychological impact of sexual harassment. In M.

- A. Paludi (Ed.), *Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus* (pp. 73-92).
Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lott, B., Reilly, M.E., & Howard, D.R. (1982). Sexual assault and harassment and a campus community case study. *Signs*, 8, 296-319.
- Matchen, J., & DeSouza, E. (2000). The sexual harassment of faculty members by students. *Sex Roles*, 42, 295-306.
- Mazer, D.B., & Percival, E.F. (1989). Ideology or experience? The relationship among perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of sexual harassment in university students. *Sex Roles*, 20, 135-147.
- McKinney, K. (1990). Sexual harassment of university faculty by colleagues and students. *Sex Roles*, 23, 421-438.
- McKinney, K. (1992). Contrapower sexual harassment: The effects of student sex and type of behavior on faculty perceptions. *Sex Roles*, 27, 627-643.
- McKinney, K. (1994). Sexual harassment and college faculty members. *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 15, 171-191.
- McKinney, K., & Crittendon, K. (1992). Contrapower sexual harassment: The offender's viewpoint. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology*, 20, 3-10.
- McKinney, K., Olson, C., & Satterfield, A. (1988). Graduate students' experiences with and responses to sexual harassment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 3, 319 - 325.
- O'Donohue, W., Downs, K., & Yeater, E. (1998). Sexual harassment: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 3, 111-128.
- O'Hare & O'Donohue. (1998). Sexual harassment: Identifying risk factors . *Archives of*

Sexual Behavior, 27(6), 561-580.

Pryor, J. B. (1985). The lay person's understanding of sexual harassment. *Sex Roles*, 13, 273-286.

Pryor, J.B., & Day, J.D. (1988). Interpretations of sexual harassment: An attributional analysis. *Sex Roles*, 18, 405-417.

Pryor, J.B., LaVite, C., & Stoller, L. (1993). A social psychological analysis of sexual harassment: The person/situation interaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42, 68-81.

Rospenda, K. M., Richman, J. A., & Nawyn, S. J. (1998) Doing power: The confluence of gender, race, and class in contrapower sexual harassment. *Gender and Society*, 12, 40-60.

Rotundo, M., Nguyen, D. H., & Sackett, P. R. (2001). A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 914-922.

Salisbury, J. , Ginori, A.B., Remick, H., & Stringer, D.M. (1986). Counselling victims of sexual harassment. *Psychotherapy*, 23(2), 316-324.

Samuels, H. (2003). Sexual harassment in the workplace: a feminist analysis of recent developments in the UK. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 26, 467- 482.

Sbraga, T. P., & O'Donohue, W. (2000). Sexual harassment. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 11, 258-286.

Schneider, B. E. (1987). Graduate women, sexual harassment, and university policy. *Journal of Higher Education*, 58, 46-65.

Shelton, J. N., & Chavous, T. M. (1999). Black and white college women's perceptions of

sexual harassment. *Sex Roles*, 40, 593 – 615.

Sigal, J., Braden-Maguire, J., Patt, I., Goodrich, C., & Perrino, C. S. (2003). Effects of type of coping response, setting, and social context on reactions to sexual harassment. *Sex Roles*, 48, 157 – 166.

Solylo-Pasek, C. (1994). Graduate students' experiences of sexual harassment. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, Canada.

Stockdale, M.S., and Vaux, A. (1993). What sexual harassment experiences lead respondents to acknowledge being sexually harassed? A secondary analysis of a university survey. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 43, 221-234.

Stockdale, M.S., Vaux, A., & Cashin, J. (1995). Acknowledging sexual harassment: A test of alternative models. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 469-496.

Tangri, S., Burt, M., & Johnson, L. (1982). Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38, 33–54.

Wayne, J.H. (2000). Disentangling the power bases of sexual harassment: Comparing gender, age, and position power. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57, 301-325.

Welsh, S. (1999). Gender and sexual harassment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 169-190.

Wilson, F. & Thompson, P. (2001). Sexual harassment as an exercise of power. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 8, 61-83.

Wise, S. & Stanley, L. (1987). *Georgie Porgie: Sexual Harassment in Everyday Life*. London: Pandora Press.

Appendix A

Hypothetical Sexual Harassment Scenarios

Professor Jones is an associate professor (*or graduate student*). She (*or he*) teaches (*as a part-time course instructor*) at a medium sized public institution in Ontario. She (*or he*) teaches undergraduate (*or graduate*) courses in a large department on campus. Last semester, Professor Jones had a male (*or female*) student in one her (*or his*) classes. This student often came to see Professor Jones to discuss aspects related to the class. One day during office hours, this student (*or Professor Jones*) sat in a rather seductive position close to the professor (*or student*), and made comments about how attractive Professor Jones (*or the student*) was.

When you were reading the description above, did you identify more with Professor Jones, the student, or neither/both? Please check one of the following options:

More with Professor Jones _____

More with the student _____

Neither _____

Both equally _____

Appendix B

Attitudes toward Feminism and the Women's Movement (FWM) Scale

Please answer the following statements according to your personal beliefs. Mark each statement according to how much you agree or disagree with it by placing an X in the appropriate box.					
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1. The leaders of the women's movement may be extreme, but they have the right idea.					
2. There are better ways for women to fight for equality than through the women's movement.					
3. More people would favour the women's movement if they knew more about it.					
4. The women's movement has positively influenced relationships between men and women.					
5. The women's movement is too radical and extreme in its views.					
6. The women's movement has made important gains in equal rights and political power for women.					
7. Feminists are too visionary for a practical world.					
8. Feminist principles should be adopted everywhere.					
9. Feminists are a menace to this nation and the world.					
10. I am overjoyed that women's liberation is finally happening in this country.					

Appendix C

Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ)

For each item, please check the box underneath the word or phrase which most closely describes your own experience as a University of Windsor graduate student. If you check any of the options other than “never”, please indicate whether the person involved was a man, woman, or both by checking under the appropriate box. Please note: These questions refer specifically to your experiences as a University of Windsor graduate student only.

Have you ever been in a situation where...	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Most of the time	Male	Female	Both
1a. a professor habitually told suggestive stories or offensive jokes?								
b. another graduate student told suggestive stories or offensive jokes?								
c. an undergraduate student told suggestive stories or offensive jokes?								
2a. a professor made crudely sexual remarks, either publicly in class, or to you privately?								
b. another graduate student made crudely sexual remarks, either publicly in class, or to you privately?								
c. an undergraduate student made crudely sexual remarks, either publicly in class, or to you privately?								
3a. the professor used sexist or suggestive teaching materials (e.g., pictures, stories, pornography), other than in classes on human sexuality or similar topics?								
b. another graduate student used sexist or suggestive teaching materials (e.g., pictures, stories, pornography), other than in classes on human sexuality or similar topics?								
c. an undergraduate student used sexist or suggestive teaching materials (e.g., pictures, stories, pornography), other than in classes on human sexuality or similar topics?								
4a. a professor treated you “differently” because of your gender?								

Have you ever been in a situation where...	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Most of the time	Male	Female	Both
b. another graduate student treated you "differently" because of your gender?								
c. an undergraduate student treated you "differently" because of your gender?								
5a. a professor made sexist remarks (e.g., supporting the concept of gender appropriate careers).								
b. another graduate student made sexist remarks (e.g., supporting the concept of gender appropriate careers).								
c. an undergraduate student made sexist remarks (e.g., supporting the concept of gender appropriate careers).								
6a. a professor made remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities that made you uncomfortable?								
b. another graduate student made remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities that made you uncomfortable?								
c. an undergraduate student made remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities that made you uncomfortable?								
7a. a professor was staring, leering, or ogling you in a way that was inappropriate, or that made you uncomfortable								
b. another graduate student was staring, leering, or ogling you in a way that was inappropriate, or that made you uncomfortable								
c. an undergraduate student was staring, leering, or ogling you in a way that was inappropriate, or that made you uncomfortable								
8a. a professor made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal sexual matters (e.g., attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?								

Have you ever been in a situation where...	Never	Once or twice	Some-times	Often	Most of the time	Male	Female	Both
b. another graduate student made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal sexual matters (e.g., attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?								
c. an undergraduate student made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal sexual matters (e.g., attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?								
9a. a professor engaged in what you considered seductive behavior towards you (e.g. made flattering or suggestive remarks, asked you for a date, suggested that you get together for a drink, offered to give you a backrub)?								
b. another graduate student engaged in what you considered seductive behavior towards you (e.g. made flattering or suggestive remarks, asked you for a date, suggested that you get together for a drink, offered to give you a backrub)?								
c. an undergraduate student engaged in what you considered seductive behavior towards you (e.g. made flattering or suggestive remarks, asked you for a date, suggested that you get together for a drink, offered to give you a backrub)?								
10a. you received unwanted sexual attention from a professor?								
b. you received unwanted sexual attention from another graduate student?								
c. you received unwanted sexual attention from an undergraduate student?								
11a. a professor attempted to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you?								
b. another graduate student attempted to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you?								
c. an undergraduate student attempted to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you?								
12a. a professor "propositioned" you?								
b. another graduate student "propositioned" you?								

Have you ever been in a situation where...	Never	Once or twice	Some-times	Often	Most of the time	Male	Female	Both
c. an undergraduate student "propositioned" you?								
13a. a professor made deliberate attempts to touch, fondle, kiss, or grab you?								
b. another graduate student made deliberate attempts to touch, fondle, kiss, or grab you?								
c. an undergraduate student made deliberate attempts to touch, fondle, kiss, or grab you?								
14a. a professor made unwanted attempts to touch or fondle you (e.g., stroking your leg or neck, touching your chest and so forth)?								
b. another graduate student made unwanted attempts to touch or fondle you (e.g., stroking your leg or neck, touching your chest and so forth)?								
c. an undergraduate student made unwanted attempts to touch or fondle you (e.g., stroking your leg or neck, touching your chest and so forth)?								
15a. you have felt you were being subtly bribed with some sort of <i>reward</i> (e.g., good grades or preferential treatment) to engage in sexual behavior with a professor?								
b. you have felt you were being subtly bribed with some sort of <i>reward</i> (e.g., help in a particularly difficult course) to engage in sexual behavior with another graduate student?								
c. you have felt you were being subtly bribed with some sort of <i>reward</i> (e.g., a positive class evaluation) to engage in sexual behavior with an undergraduate student?								
16a. you actually were rewarded by a professor for being socially or sexually <i>cooperative</i> (e.g., going out to dinner, having drinks, establishing a sexual relationship)?								
b. you were actually rewarded by another graduate student for being socially or sexually <i>cooperative</i> (e.g., going out to dinner, having drinks, establishing a sexual relationship)?								

Have you ever been in a situation where...	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Most of the time	Male	Female	Both
c. you were actually rewarded by an undergraduate student for being socially or sexually <i>cooperative</i> (e.g., going out to dinner, having drinks, establishing a sexual relationship)?								
17a. you felt you were being subtly threatened with some sort of "punishment" for not being sexually cooperative with a professor?								
b. you felt you were being subtly threatened with some sort of "punishment" for not being sexually cooperative with another graduate student?								
c. you felt you were being subtly threatened with some sort of "punishment" for not being sexually cooperative with an undergraduate student?								
18a. you actually experienced some negative consequences for refusing to engage in sexual activity with a professor?								
b. you actually experienced some negative consequences for refusing to engage in sexual activity with another graduate student								
c. you actually experienced some negative consequences for refusing to engage in sexual activity with an undergraduate student								
19a. you were raped by a professor?								
b. you were raped by another graduate student?								
c. you were raped by an undergraduate student ?								
20a. you have been sexually harassed by a professor?								
b. you have been sexually harassed by another graduate student?								
c. you have been sexually harassed by an undergraduate student?								

Appendix D

Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale

Please answer the following statements according to your personal beliefs. Mark each statement according to how much you agree or disagree with it by placing an X in the appropriate box.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. An attractive woman has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.					
2. Most men are sexually teased by many of the women with whom they interact on the job or at school.					
3. Most women who are sexually insulted by a man provoke his behaviour by the way they talk, act, or dress.					
4. A man must learn to understand that a women's "no" to his sexual advances really means "no".					
5. It is only natural for a woman to use her sexuality as a way of getting ahead in school or at work.					
6. An attractive man has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.					
7. I believe that sexual intimidation is a serious social problem.					
8. It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a women he finds attractive.					
9. Innocent flirtations make the workday or school day interesting.					
10. Encouraging a professor's or a supervisor's sexual interest is frequently used by women to get better grades or to improve their work situations.					
11. One of the problems with sexual harassment is that some women can't take a joke.					

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
12. The notion that what a professor does in class may be sexual harassment is taking the idea of sexual harassment too far.					
13. Many charges of sexual harassment are frivolous and vindictive.					
14. A lot of what people call sexual harassment is just normal flirtation between men and women.					
15. Sexual assault and sexual harassment are two completely different things.					
16. Sexual harassment refers to those incidents of unwanted sexual attention that aren't too serious.					
17. Sexual harassment has little to do with power.					
18. Sexism and sexual harassment are two completely different things.					
19. All this concern about sexual harassment makes it harder for men and women to have normal relationships.					

Appendix E

Demographic Questions

1. Age: _____
2. Gender: _____
3. Do you identify yourself as an Aboriginal (e.g., Metis, status/nonstatus Indian) person?
 Yes _____ No _____
4. If your answer to question #3 was 'No', which ethnic or cultural group do you identify with?
 - ☐ Central American (El Salvador, Honduras, etc.)
 - ☐ Scandinavian (Denmark, Sweden, Norway)
 - ☐ French Canadian
 - ☐ English Canadian
 - ☐ British (Scotland, Wales, England, N. Ireland)
 - ☐ W. European (France, Germany, Holland, etc.)
 - ☐ E. European (Russia, Poland, Baltic States, Hungary, etc.)
 - ☐ S. European (Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, etc.)
 - ☐ Far Eastern (Japan, China, India, Hong Kong, etc.)
 - ☐ African (specify if North, Central, or South) _____
 - ☐ Caribbean
 - ☐ Middle Eastern (Israel, Lebanon, Iran, Iraq, etc.)
 - ☐ Latin American
 - ☐ Other (please specify) _____
5. Department: _____
6. Do you currently hold or have you held a GA, TA, and /or a sessional position at the University? Please circle the appropriate box.

Yes-go to # 7	No-you are finished!
---------------	----------------------
7. How would you describe your GA, TA, and /or sessional duties? Circle more than one box if two or more descriptions are appropriate.

Teaching: Lecture or tutorial	Marking and grading	Research assistant
-------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------

Appendix F

Introductory Email

Dear fellow graduate student,

My name is Charmaine Mohipp and I am an M.A. student in Psychology here at the University of Windsor. I am currently conducting research exploring graduate students' perceptions of and experiences with social situations in University life.

Participation in my study is open to female and male graduate students across disciplines at any stage of their graduate programs. Only half of all full-time graduate students will be asked to participate. You have been randomly selected from a list of all graduate students. Over the next few days, the Registrar's Office will be mailing survey packages to your student mailboxes. Please read the letter of information inside and seriously consider participating in the study. Participation will only take 15 minutes of your time and will help a fellow graduate student as well as provide a greater understanding of graduate students' views. All responses are completely anonymous. You will be invited to participate in a \$100 lottery as my thanks for your time and effort.

Thank you for your time,

Charmaine Mohipp, M.A. student

Department of Psychology

Appendix G

Letter of Information**CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH**

Please read this page so that you know what this study is about and what you are being asked to do. It is our responsibility to make sure that you are familiar with the general nature of the study, and that you understand the risks and benefits associated with participating in this study. In this way, you can decide in a free and informed manner, whether you want to participate or not. By filling out these questionnaires and returning them anonymously in the addressed envelope, you are indicating that you know about the study and that you agree to participate.

TITLE OF STUDY: Graduate Students' Experiences of and Attitudes About the University's Social Environment

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Charmaine Mohipp, under the supervision of Dr. Charlene Senn, from the Department of Psychology at the University of Windsor. The study is being done to fulfill the requirements of an M.A. thesis. If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact the primary researcher at [redacted] or Charlene Senn at 519-253-3000 ext. 2256.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study will examine graduate students' experiences and attitudes in relation to other graduate students, faculty members, and undergraduate students at the University of Windsor and to general social attitudes.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following things:

Read a story about a teaching situation and provide your assessment of it. Fill out a number of questionnaires about your attitudes toward social situations and the roles of men and women. Completing these tasks should take you no more than 15 - 20 minutes. You will return the questionnaire anonymously by putting the completed questionnaire in the large envelope addressed to the researcher, then sending it through the intra-university mailing system. You will mail the lottery ballot in a separate envelope to someone not associated with the research (Psychology Department secretary).

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

Some questions in the survey are of a very personal nature including some questions about experiences of unwanted sexual or social behaviour. These questions ask about your experiences as a University of Windsor graduate student. If you feel uncomfortable answering any of these questions, you are free to not answer these questions or to not return the questionnaire. A list of community resources is included in the package, as well as on the following website: www.uwindsor.ca/mohippstudy. Please feel free to contact any of these resources if you would like to talk about your experiences further.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

There is no benefit to you beyond the contribution to knowledge. Your answers will allow a greater understanding of the ways graduate students perceive social situations they may encounter.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

If you complete and return the questionnaire, you are eligible to be entered into a draw for 100 dollars. In order to participate in the draw, you will fill out a draw slip with your name and contact information and mail it to a person unaffiliated with this research. A random draw of the returned ballots will be conducted at the conclusion of the study and the winner will be notified. You are free to decline to participate in the draw.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential. Your questionnaire responses are anonymous. The questionnaire has no identifying marks on it, and you should not put your name on any part of the questionnaire. It is mailed to the researcher separately. If you fill out and mail back the draw slip, your personal information cannot be connected to your survey responses since they are mailed to separate addresses. When the lottery has taken place, all ballots will be destroyed.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. You will receive a reminder to complete the survey two weeks after they are distributed. This is intended as a gentle reminder only and the researcher has no way of knowing whether or not you have already returned the survey.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE SUBJECTS

You can obtain feedback of the study by checking the University of Windsor REB website in the Fall of 2005. If you do not have internet access, you can also obtain feedback sheets posted on the door of the researcher's office in Chrysler Hall South, Room 188.

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

This data will not be used in subsequent studies.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact:

Research Ethics Coordinator
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario
N9B 3P4

Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3916
E-mail: lbunn@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

Signature of Investigator

Date

VITA AUCTORIS

Charmaine Mohipp was born in 1978 in Winnipeg, Manitoba. She graduated high school from St. Mary's Academy in 1996. From there she went on to the University of Manitoba where she obtained a B.Sc. in 1999 and B.A. in Psychology in 2002. She completed her M.A. in Applied Social Psychology at the University of Windsor, Ontario, in 2005.